



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/669,730	09/26/2000	Frampton E. Ellis	PM 265678	5626
909	7590	07/28/2004	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP			DINH, DUNG C	
P.O. BOX 10500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102			2152	
DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/669,730	ELLIS, FRAMPTON E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dung Dinh	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 52-117 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 52-57 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 57-117 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5.7.</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

Specification Objection

The specification does not contain an abstract. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985) *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 52-57 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-83 of US patent 6,167,428.

The subject matters claimed in the instant application are fully claimed in the patent as follows:

Present application

Patent 6,167,428

Art Unit: 2152

Claim 52: A apparatus comprising:
a firewall configured to operate
...with other computers connected
in a network;

Claim 1: ... a firewall for said
personal computer to limit access
...

said personal computer includes
at least two microprocessors;

at least one of said computers
including at least two
microprocessors ...

said firewall configured to deny
access to at least a first
microprocessor...

said firewall denies access by
said network to at least one of
said microprocessors ...

said firewall configured to allow
access to at least a second
microprocessor ...

said firewall permitting access
by the network to said slave
microprocessor.

The same rationale for double patenting applies to
independent claim 55 of the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been

Art Unit: 2152

obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 58-117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberry US patent 5,349,682 and further in view of Hagersten et al. US patent 5,862,357.

As per claim 58, Rosenberry discloses a system comprising:
at least two personal computers [col.3 lines 7-28];
means for providing network services including shared computer processing to be provided to said at least two personal computers within said network [col.3 lines 29-45];
means for at least one of the computer, when idled by a personal user to be made available temporarily to provide said shared computer processing to said network [col.3 lines 50-59].

Rosenberry does not specifically disclose a firewall for denying access to a first memory hardware and permitting access to a second memory hardware.

In similar field of invention of sharing resources, Hagerstent teaches to protect local memory from access by other processing system to prevent corruption local storage. [see abstract]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Rosenberry with a firewall to protect certain memory hardware and permit access to other

Art Unit: 2152

memory hardware because it would have prevent unauthorized access and corruption of nonshared memory and thereby improved the security of the personal computer being used for shared processing.

As per the various limitations recited in claims 59-115, they are apparent or would have been an obvious variation from the teaching of Rosenberry as modified.

As per claims 116-117, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 58 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 52-54 and 55-57 are allowed. The prior art does not teach a firewall configured to deny access to a first microprocessor and permit access to a second microprocessor of the personal computer by other computer on the network during a shared operation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Art Unit: 2152

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
July 22, 2004